REMARKS

The courtesy of the Examiner in granting a telephone interview on April 14, 2006 is acknowledged with sincere appreciation. During the interview, the Examiner suggested that special definitions for the splines should be included in the claims. The Examiner indicated that such special definitions may render Applicant's claims distinguishable over the prior art references.

The specification was amended to define the splines as being "any of a series of projections on the part or shaft that fit together into grooves or slots on a corresponding shaft, enabling both to rotate together".

Claim 1 has been amended to define the splines as "projections on said body that cooperate with slots on a corresponding shaft enabling cooperative rotation ".

Claims 8-16 have been withdrawn as a result of an earlier restriction requirement.

Claims 1-4, 7, and 17-18 remain in the application.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harsch (U.S. Patent 5,315,805). The Examiner stated:

> "Harsch disclose (Fig.1) a splined component (10) for transmitting torque comprising: a main body (inner cylindrical portion of 10) of formable metal (aluminum, col. 1, lines 50-51) having a longitudinal axis; a plurality of spaced apart splines (11) of said formable metal extending away from said body and being generally parallel to the axis of said body, and a plurality of small raised portions (side portions of 20) of said formable metal extending away from said main body and being generally parallel to the axis of the body, the splines, raised portion, and body are integral and homogenous.
> Claim 2. Harsch disclose that said main body is hollow (col. 3 lines 66-68).
> Claim 3. Harsch disclose that said splines extend inwardly (from raised portions toward main body).
> Claim 4. Harsch. disclose that said raised portion is uninterrupted.
> Claim 17. Harsch discloses that the raised portions are disposed between said spaced apart splines.
> Claim 18. Harsch discloses that the raised portions are disposed on the surface of said spaced apart splines."

In accordance with the helpful suggestions of the Examiner, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the limitation that the splines are projections on said body that cooperate with slots on a corresponding shaft enabling cooperative rotation. Harsch shows a structure wherein cross-sectionally shaped T webs 11 terminate in thickened ends 20. The cross-sectionally shaped T webs 11 shown are included in a support shaped section 10 and are used to detachably affix at least one beam for supporting wall/ceiling segments (Col. 1 lines 18-21). In the structure shown by Harsch, lateral retaining elements 15, 16 that terminate in a jaw-like bend 19 are tightened and reach behind the thickened ends 20 of the cross-sectionally shaped T webs 11 of the support section 10 (col. 4 lines 25-28). Accordingly, the beams engage adjacent cross-sectionally shaped T webs 11 and are locked into place to prevent relative movement. The cross-sectionally shaped T webs 11 shown by Harsch do not aid in cooperative rotation as recited in Applicant's Claim 1, as amended, but actually function to militate against rotation. The cross-sectionally shaped T webs 11 do not fit together into slots on a corresponding shaft to enable cooperative rotation. No such structure is shown by Harcsh. Harsch does not show or suggest splines as recited in Applicant's Claim 1, as amended. Since the limitations of Applicant's Claim 1 are not shown or suggested by the reference cited by the Examiner, it is submitted that Claim 1, as amended, contains allowable subject matter and should be patentable.

Since Claims 2-4 and 17-18 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and include further limitations, these Claims are submitted to be patentable.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harsch (U.S. Patent 4,552,544) in view of Mangas (U.S. Patent 4,716,276). The Examiner stated:

> "Harsch discloses that the formable metal is aluminum (col. 1 lines 50-51) but does not expressly state that the aluminum is an aluminum alloy. Mangas teaches (col. 4 lines 1-12) that splined components should preferably be made of aluminum alloys for the purpose of reducing weight. Furthermore, it is well known that aluminum alloys (e.g., such as aluminum alloyed with titanium) are stronger and lighter than pure aluminum. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Harsch aluminum material to be an aluminum alloy, as illustrated by Mangas, for the purpose of decreasing weight and increasing strength."

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and contains all of the limitations thereof. For the reasons stated above, the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose splines as recited in Applicant's Claim 1, as amended. It is submitted that Claim 7 should be allowable along with Claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Since the application, as amended, appears to be in condition for allowance, a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

While the applicants' attorney has made a sincere effort to properly define applicants' invention and to distinguish the same from the prior art, should the Examiner deem that other language would be more appropriate, it is requested that a telephone interview be had with the applicants' attorney in a sincere effort to expedite the prosecution of the application.